REMARKS

A total of 23 claims remain in the present application. The foregoing amendments are presented in response to the Office Action mailed February 15, 2006, wherefore reconsideration of this application is requested. By way of the above-noted amendments, claims 6, 15, 21, 22 and 24 have been amended to more clearly define features of the present invention, and in particular to define that the method of the present invention is performed entirely within the token, rather than using resources of a handset, for example. In preparing the foregoing claim amendments, careful attention was paid to ensure that no new subject matter has been introduced.

Referring now to the text of the Advisory Action:

- claims 15 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for alleged lack or proper antecedent support; and
- claims 2-22 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the teaching of United States Patent No. 6,968,209 (Ahlgren et al.) in view of United States Patent No. 6,879,989 (Cheng et al.)

The Examiner's claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 103 are believed to be traversed in view of the above-noted claim amendments, and further in view of following discussion.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

It is believed that the Examiner's objections to claims 15 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 have been fully addressed by the above-noted amendments in these claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As an initial mater, Applicant notes that United States Patent No. 6,968,209 (Ahlgren et al.) is closely related to the Novak application (WO 01/03409) cited in the previous Office Action mailed October 20, 2005. In fact, WO 01/03409 (Novak) claims priority from the same United States Patent Application (Serial No. 09/507,685) which subsequently issued as United States Patent No. 6,968,209 (Ahlgren et al.). As such, both references teach almost identical subject matter, and Applicant's comments submitted in the

response filed January 20, 2005, regarding the non-applicability of the Novak application, will also apply, *mutis mutandis*, to the teaching of its parent, Ahlgren et al.

In summary, according to the presently claimed invention the registering element remains synchronised by means of processes executing on the token alone, independent of whatever mobile handset the token may be docked in, because the synchronisation makes no use of any process that would be performed in the mobile handset The person of ordinary skill in the art will recognise the clear distinction between this operation of the present invention and the teaching of Novak/Ahlgren which relies upon a change-log in the hosting mobile handset.

As well-known in the art, a changelog is a picture of the changes occurred since the last synchronisation. The handset-based changelog of Novak/Ahlgren stores a CDC on the handset which must remain the same as a corresponding CDC which is stored in the SIM card. This way, it is permanently ensured that both the SIM card and the handset have not been separated, even momentarily, so that the changelog duly reflects the changes which have really occurred in the SIM card.

The synchronisation process of Novak/Ahlgren is based on the traditional use of a changelog, i.e. if the changelog is assured to be reliable, it is regularly transmitted to a remote database for an updating of the database. The updating is targeted at the records which are present in the changelog, i.e. only the records which have changed since the last synchronisation.

According to the presently claimed invention, no use is made of any changelog as in Novak/Ahlgren. No changelog is needed in any device which may be external to the token (or SIM card) such as the mobile handset.

According to the presently claimed invention the token stores a respective Change Detection Code associated with each record. This CDC represents the state of the record as at the last synchronisation step. At some point in time, the electronic token makes a calculation of the CDC associated with an involved record. Should the current CDC be different from the stored CDC, this means that the content of the record has changed and a new synchronisation is necessary.

According to the invention, the stored CDC and the current CDC are compared inside the electronic token, the current CDC is calculated inside the electronic token, and the stored CDC is stored inside the electronic token. In case the stored CDC is not equal to the current CDC, i.e. the involved record has to be synchronised in the external registering element, it is also the electronic token itself which prepares and sends a short message (SMS) to the registering element.

Therefore, thanks to using internal CDCs and comparing them inside the electronic token, and making use of the result of the comparison inside the electronic token by preparing a SMS message inside the electronic token, the present invention allows synchronization with a remote database synchronised without requiring any help nor depending in any way on information stored the mobile handset which hosts the electronic token. As a result, the remote registering element remains synchronised independently of whichever mobile handset the token is docked in at any particular moment.

As the records which have changed are identified quickly and simply inside the token and by the token itself, the modified records are, according to the presently claimed invention, encapsulated in an SMS by the card itself and the SMS is sent by the token to the registering element to be updated without requiring any processing by the mobile phone other than simply transmitting the SMS to the registering element.

Ahlgren et al do not teach or fairly suggest calculating and comparing two CDCs (that is, a CDC calculated during a previous synchronization, and a current CDC) inside the card itself. Furthermore, Ahlgren et al. do not teach or fairly suggest associating respective CDCs to each record of the electronic token. Finally, Ahlgren does not teach or fairly suggest preparing an SMS inside the card itself. Hence Ahlgren does not offer any teaching that would provide a similar benefit as the present invention, such as keeping updated a remote phonebook as a mirror of the phonebook of the electronic token, without any necessity for a changelog nor a CDC stored in the mobile handset itself.

The other cited references fail to provide the missing teaching.

United States Patent No. 6,879,989 (Cheng et al.) teaches a synchronisation method which applies for "handheld computers, such as Palm, Windows CE devices, various embedded systems, and smart card based systems" (col 3, 11 to 3). "smart card based

systems" must be understood in Cheng as mobile phones which host a SIM card, but not SIM cards or electronic tokens themselves.

Cheng does not teach or fairly suggest that it is even possible to execute a synchronisation process inside an electronic token itself. Therefore, should the person skilled in the art have combined the Ahlgren and Cheng teachings, the skilled person would not have been led to the claimed invention. Indeed, due to the fact that both Ahlgren and Cheng implement a synchronisation method that is based on central processings which are performed outside an electronic token, and in particular niether of Ahlgren nor Cheng recommends a CDC comparison inside the electronic token itself, the combination of Ahlgren and Cheng would necessarily lead the ordinarily skilled artisan away from the subject matter of the presently claimed invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the presently claimed invention is clearly distinguishable over the teachings of the cited references, taken alone or in any combination. Thus it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and early action in that respect is courteously solicited.

If any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this response, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-5113.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Kent Daniels, P.Eng.
Reg. No. 44,206
Attorney for the Applicants

Date: June 15, 2006

Ogilvy Renault LLP
Suite 1500
1981 McGill College Avenue
Montreal, Quebec
Canada, H3A 2Y3
(613) 780-8673